

EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone conference of February 19, 2010.

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-20, 22-37 and 44-47 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4-20, 22-37 and 44-47 stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, 22, 23, and 34 have been amended, and Claims 35-37, and 46 have been cancelled. Minor amendments have been made to the claims to simply overcome the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application, drawings and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1, 2, 4-20, 22-32, 44, 45 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended Claims 2 and 23 to overcome the rejections. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 & § 103

Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Draenert (U.S. Pat. No. 6,682,566). Claims 34-36 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mullers (U.S. Pat. No. 5,133,763). Claims 34-37 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullers (U.S. Pat. No. 5,133,763). These claims have been cancelled, thus obviating the rejection.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 1, 2, 4-20, 22-32, 44, 45, and 47 would be allowable if amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections. Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 22, and 34 as discussed during the telephone interview to overcome the Examiner's objections. Therefore, Applicants submit all pending claims should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

3/11/10

By: _____



Christopher A. Eusebi
Reg. No. 44,672

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

CAE/smb
15299569.1